

**Egan, Veronica**  
**Page 1 of 2**

Forwarded by Susan K Kozacek/R3/USDAFS on 10/16/2003  
05:34 PM -----  
veroegan@cs.com  
10/12/2003 06:20 AM

To: skozacek@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement for Tucson Electric  
Power's  
proposed 345 kilovolt powerline

Ms. Sue Kozacek  
Coronado National Forest  
Federal Building, 300 West Congress  
Tucson, AZ 85701

Dear Ms. Kozacek,

1 I am writing on behalf of the 2000+ members of the Great Old  
Broads for Wilderness to urge you to withdraw the current  
draft Environmental Impact Statement for Tucson Electric  
Power's proposed 345 kilovolt powerline. Many of our  
members enjoy the wild places of Southeastern Arizona for  
hiking, birding and solitude.

2 TEP's proposed "Western Route" and alternative "Crossover  
Route" would carve through some of the most remote and wild  
areas in Southeast Arizona, forever scarring the beautiful and  
irreplaceable landscape of the Tumacacori Highlands. This  
area contains several roadless areas as well as a citizen's  
proposed Wilderness area home to black bears, Mexican  
spotted owls, lesser-long nosed bats and peregrine falcons as  
well as lesser known species such as the Sonora chub,  
Mexican vine snake, elegant trogon and the Gentry indigo  
bush. A jaguar was sighted in this area only two years ago.

#### **Comment No. 1**

Sections 3.1.2 and 4.1.2 present a description of the existing recreational opportunities, including hiking and birding, and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project.

#### **Comment No. 2**

Sections 3.1 and 4.1 describe existing land use resources and analyze potential impacts to these resources, including potential impacts to the Tumacacori Mountains and the Tumacacori EMA of the Coronado National Forest.

Sections 3.1, Land Use, and 3.12, Transportation, discuss the IRAs within the Coronado National Forest. Sections 4.1, Land Use, and 4.12, Transportation, evaluate potential impacts to IRAs.

Section 5.2.4 acknowledges the citizen-initiated proposal for an addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sections 3.3 and 4.3 discuss the existing biological resources and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project, including potential impacts to wildlife.

Egan, Veronica  
Page 2 of 2

3 The important goal of providing fully reliable electrical service to the city of Nogales and Santa Cruz County must be achieved. Unfortunately, instead of building the small transmission line necessary to achieve this goal, TEP has proposed a massive, environmentally destructive, and extremely controversial powerline designed to export power to Mexico.

4 The draft EIS is clearly inadequate, because it does not address important alternatives to TEP's powerline which would provide reliable service without destroying our environmental and cultural heritage, and which would not require huge increases to consumers' electricity bills.

5 The recent blackout in the Northeast is an urgent reminder that our energy policy should be based on serving the public interest, not corporate private profits. I urge DOE to issue a new draft EIS which fully and rigorously explores all available options-including a local power plant and smaller power lines which would not serve Mexico-to meet the important public interest of providing reliable energy service to Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,

Veronica Egan  
850 1/2 Main St.  
Durango, Colorado 81302

### Comment No. 3

TEP's purpose and need for the proposed project, as provided to DOE in TEP's Presidential Permit Application, is "...to construct a double-circuit 345 kV, alternating current transmission line to interconnect the existing electrical systems of TEP and Citizens Utilities ("Citizens") in Nogales, Arizona, with a further interconnection to be made from Nogales, Arizona to the CFE transmission system..." When a Federal agency is evaluating a request for a permit for a proposed action developed by a non-Federal applicant (e.g., TEP), CEQ has opined that Federal agencies should select alternatives which are feasible given the applicant's stated goals and reflect the "common sense realities" of the situation. Therefore, the Federal agencies are evaluating the proposed project presented by TEP to each of the Federal agencies (see Section 1.2.2, Federal Agencies' Purpose and Need Statements).

### Comment No. 4

Section 1.2 of the Final EIS explains the roles of the Federal agencies in developing alternatives for the proposed project. Where an applicant seeks a permit for a particular business project, such as the case with TEP's proposed project, the Federal agencies generally limit their review of alternatives to those that would satisfy the applicant's proposal and decide whether that proposal is or is not worthy of receiving a permit. The Federal agencies do not review alternatives that are not within the scope of the applicant's proposal. Similarly, the agencies do not direct the applicant to alter its proposal; instead, the agencies decide whether a permit is appropriate for the proposal as the applicant envisions it. It is not for the agency to run the applicant's business and to change the applicant's proposal, but only to evaluate the environmental effects of the applicant's business proposal as offered. Accordingly, the EIS evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives, which include the full spectrum of alternatives that would satisfy the applicant's proposal.

**Comment No. 5**

A new power plant in Nogales is not a viable alternative to a new, second transmission line (part of TEP's proposal). Therefore, the alternative of a new power plant is not evaluated in detail in this EIS. Likewise, a smaller transmission line in lieu of the proposed 345-kV line would not meet the international interconnection aspect of TEP's proposal, and therefore is not evaluated in detail in this EIS. (Refer also to Section 2.1.5, Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Further Analysis).

**Elton, Wallace**  
**Page 1 of 2**

Comments on the DEIS for TEP's proposed 345 kv powerline

From: eb@vermontel.net [SMTP:eb@vermontel.net]  
To: Pell, Jerry  
Cc:

Subject: Comments on the DEIS for TEP's proposed 345 kv powerline  
Sent: 10/14/2003 9:35 PM  
Importance: Normal

Dr. Jerry Pell  
U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy (FE-27)  
1000 Independence Avenue. SW  
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Dr. Pell,

Because I have relatives who live in Arizona, I have been fortunate over a period of many years to travel throughout the state. As a result, I know the beauty of many remaining wildlands in the state, including those within the Coronado National Forest.

For this reason, I am writing to ask that you withdraw the current draft EIS for Tucson Electric Power's proposed 345 kilovolt powerline.

Both the proposed "Western Route" and the alternative "Crossover Route" would cut through some of the most remote and wild areas in southeastern Arizona, the Tumacacori Highlands. Encompassing several roadless areas (including an area many would like to see designated as Wilderness), this area provides habitat for black bears, lesser-

#### **Comment No. 1**

Sections 3.2 and 4.2 present a description of the existing visual resources, including those within the Coronado National Forest, and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project.

#### **Comment No. 2**

Sections 3.1 and 4.1 describe existing land use resources and analyze potential impacts to these resources, including potential impacts to the Tumacacori Mountains and the Tumacacori EMA of the Coronado National Forest.

Sections 3.1, Land Use, and 3.12, Transportation, discuss the IRAs within the Coronado National Forest. Sections 4.1, Land Use, and 4.12, Transportation, evaluate potential impacts to IRAs.

Section 5.2.4 acknowledges the citizen-initiated proposal for an addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sections 3.3 and 4.3 discuss the existing biological resources and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project, including potential impacts to wildlife.

Elton, Wallace  
Page 2 of 2

2 | long nosed bats, Mexican spotted owls, and peregrine falcons,  
cont. | among other species.

3 | I support providing reliable electrical service to Nogales and  
Santa Cruz County. This goal can be achieved without  
scarring these wildlands, however, by building a much smaller  
transmission line than proposed by TEP. Unfortunately, the  
draft EIS does not present and assess suitable alternatives that  
would be less environmentally destructive and less expensive.  
Because of that omission, the draft EIS is seriously biased and  
clearly inadequate. Therefore, I urge you to withdraw it and  
prepare a new one that considers all available options,  
including smaller transmission lines that will meet the goal of  
providing reliable energy service to Santa Cruz County  
without sacrificing a unique public resource.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Wallace Elton  
69 Elm Hill Street  
Springfield, Vermont 05156

### Comment No. 3

Section 1.2 of the Final EIS explains the roles of the Federal agencies in developing alternatives for the proposed project. Where an applicant seeks a permit for a particular business project, such as the case with TEP's proposed project, the Federal agencies generally limit their review of alternatives to those that would satisfy the applicant's proposal and decide whether that proposal is or is not worthy of receiving a permit. The Federal agencies do not review alternatives that are not within the scope of the applicant's proposal. Similarly, the agencies do not direct the applicant to alter its proposal; instead, the agencies decide whether a permit is appropriate for the proposal as the applicant envisions it. It is not for the agency to run the applicant's business and to change the applicant's proposal, but only to evaluate the environmental effects of the applicant's business proposal as offered. Accordingly, the EIS evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives, which include the full spectrum of alternatives that would satisfy the applicant's proposal.

A smaller transmission line in lieu of the proposed 345-kV line would not meet the international interconnection aspect of TEP's proposal, and therefore is not evaluated in detail in this EIS (refer also to Section 2.1.5, Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Further Analysis).

The Draft EIS was prepared in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA, the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500-1508), and all applicable laws, regulations, and agency policies. The Federal agencies have determined that the Draft EIS does not need to be re-issued for additional review.

Evans, Dave  
Page 1 of 2

Forwarded by Susan K Kozacek/R3/USDAFS on 10/16/2003  
05:22 PM -----  
snerdley@theriver.com  
10/10/2003 11:04 AM

To: skozacek@fs.fed.us  
cc:  
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement for Tucson Electric  
Power's  
proposed 345 kilovolt powerline

Ms. Sue Kozacek  
Coronado National Forest  
Federal Building, 300 West Congress  
Tucson, AZ 85701

Dear Ms. Kozacek,

1 I am writing to urge you to withdraw the current draft  
Environmental Impact Statement for Tucson Electric Power's  
proposed 345 kilovolt powerline.

2 TEP's proposed "Western Route" and alternative "Crossover  
Route" would carve through some of the most remote and wild  
areas in Southeast Arizona, forever scarring the beautiful and  
irreplaceable landscape of the Tumacacori Highlands. This  
area contains several roadless areas as well as a citizen's  
proposed Wilderness area home to black bears, Mexican  
spotted owls, lesser-long nosed bats and peregrine falcons as  
well as lesser known species such as the Sonora chub,  
Mexican vine snake, elegant trogon and the Gentry indigo  
bush. A jaguar was sighted in this area only two years ago.

#### Comment No. 1

The commentor's opinion that the Draft EIS should be withdrawn is noted.

#### Comment No. 2

Sections 3.1 and 4.1 describe existing land use resources and analyze potential impacts to these resources, including potential impacts to the Tumacacori Mountains and the Tumacacori EMA of the Coronado National Forest.

Sections 3.1, Land Use, and 3.12, Transportation, discuss the IRAs within the Coronado National Forest. Sections 4.1, Land Use, and 4.12, Transportation, evaluate potential impacts to IRAs.

Section 5.2.4 acknowledges the citizen-initiated proposal for an addition to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sections 3.3 and 4.3 discuss the existing biological resources and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project, including potential impacts to wildlife.

#### Comment No. 3

TEP's purpose and need for the proposed project, as provided to DOE in TEP's Presidential Permit Application, is "...to construct a double-circuit 345 kV, alternating current transmission line to interconnect the existing electrical systems of TEP and Citizens Utilities ("Citizens") in Nogales, Arizona, with a further interconnection to be made from Nogales, Arizona to the CFE transmission system..."

When a Federal agency is evaluating a request for a permit for a proposed action developed by a non-Federal applicant (e.g., TEP), CEQ has opined that Federal agencies should select alternatives which are feasible given the applicant's stated goals and reflect the "common sense realities" of the situation. Therefore, the Federal agencies are evaluating the proposed project presented by TEP to each of the Federal agencies (see Section 1.2.2, Federal Agencies' Purpose and Need Statements).

Evans, Dave  
Page 2 of 2

3 The important goal of providing fully reliable electrical service to the city of Nogales and Santa Cruz County must be achieved. Unfortunately, instead of building the small transmission line necessary to achieve this goal, TEP has proposed a massive, environmentally destructive, and extremely controversial powerline designed to export power to Mexico.

4 The draft EIS is clearly inadequate, because it does not address important alternatives to TEP's powerline which would provide reliable service without destroying our environmental and cultural heritage, and which would not require huge increases to consumers' electricity bills.

5 The recent blackout in the Northeast is an urgent reminder that our energy policy should be based on serving the public interest, not corporate private profits. I urge DOE to issue a new draft EIS which fully and rigorously explores all available options-including a local power plant and smaller power lines which would not serve Mexico-to meet the important public interest of providing reliable energy service to Santa Cruz County.

6 Greed is a very powerful force in the destruction of the landscape and biodiversity of our country. It must be completely stifled in its goals.

Sincerely,

Dave Evans  
2662 W 21st Ln  
Yuma, Arizona 85364

#### Comment No. 4

Section 1.2 of the Final EIS explains the roles of the Federal agencies in developing alternatives for the proposed project. Where an applicant seeks a permit for a particular business project, such as the case with TEP's proposed project, the Federal agencies generally limit their review of alternatives to those that would satisfy the applicant's proposal and decide whether that proposal is or is not worthy of receiving a permit. The Federal agencies do not review alternatives that are not within the scope of the applicant's proposal. Similarly, the agencies do not direct the applicant to alter its proposal; instead, the agencies decide whether a permit is appropriate for the proposal as the applicant envisions it. It is not for the agency to run the applicant's business and to change the applicant's proposal, but only to evaluate the environmental effects of the applicant's business proposal as offered. Accordingly, the EIS evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives, which include the full spectrum of alternatives that would satisfy the applicant's proposal.

#### Comment No. 5

A new power plant in Nogales is not a viable alternative to a new, second transmission line (part of TEP's proposal). Therefore, the alternative of a new power plant is not evaluated in detail in this EIS. Likewise, a smaller transmission line in lieu of the proposed 345-kV line would not meet the international interconnection aspect of TEP's proposal, and therefore is not evaluated in detail in this EIS. (Refer also to Section 2.1.5, Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Further Analysis.)

#### Comment No. 6

Sections 3.1 and 4.1 discuss the existing land use and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project.

Sections 3.3 and 4.3 discuss the existing biological resources and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project, including potential impacts to biodiversity.

**Falco, Emilio**  
**Page 1 of 6**

DOE-EIScomments

From: Emilio Falco [SMTP:falco@starband.net]  
To: Pell, Jerry  
Cc: RTBNMBAZ@aol.com; LMagruder@aol.com; 'B & E Soporibell'

Subject: DOE-EIScomments  
Sent: 10/13/2003 9:22 PM  
Importance: Normal  
Please find attached comments on DOE/EIS-0336, TEP Sahuarita-Nogales Transmission Line DEIS

PO Box 3371  
Tubac, AZ 85646

13 October 2003

Dr. Jerry Pell  
Office of Electric Power Regulation  
Fossil Energy, FE-27  
US Department of Energy  
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Dr. Pell,

It is a pleasure to send you the comments that follow.

1 There are many overwhelming arguments for the “no action” decision regarding the 345kV powerline that TEP proposes to build between Sahuarita and Nogales, AZ. The current Draft EIS (DEIS) is deficient, and demonstrates that the TEP project as proposed poses unwarranted risks to the environment and the human landscape. It should be rejected. The following paragraphs provide some of the arguments.

#### **Comment No. 1**

The Draft EIS was prepared in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA, the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500-1508), and all applicable laws, regulations, and agency policies. The Federal agencies have determined that the Draft EIS does not need to be re-issued for additional review.

#### **Comment No. 2**

The Federal agencies concur with the commentor’s statement that ACC Decision No. 62011 (ACC 1999) mandates the construction of a second transmission line to serve customers in Santa Cruz County, and does not reference the export of electricity to Mexico. However, TEP’s stated purpose and need for the proposed project is a dual purpose and need of benefiting both southern Arizona and Mexico. A smaller transmission line (e.g., 115-kV line) in lieu of the proposed 345-kV line would not meet the international interconnection aspect of TEP’s proposal and, therefore, is not evaluated in detail in this EIS (refer also to Section 2.1.5, Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Further Analysis).

#### **Comment No. 3**

The potential implications of the proposed project on Federal, state, or local energy policies (e.g., regarding renewable energy or distributed and local generation) are outside the scope of the EIS. The ACC is vested with the state’s authority to decide how it believes energy should be furnished within Arizona’s borders (for example, the need for and effectiveness of transmission lines within its borders). Refer to the revised text in Section 1.1.2, The Origin of TEP’s Proposal: TEP’s Business Plan and the Proceedings of the Arizona Corporation Committee, that provides explanation of the jurisdictions and authorities of the state and Federal agencies, and their relationship to this NEPA analysis.



**Falco, Emilio**  
**Page 2 of 6**

- 1) Arizona Corporation Commission order No. 62011 is irrelevant to the project that TEP wants:
- 2 It is a misrepresentation that Citizens (now UniSource) was ordered by the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to build a 345kV power line, as TEP (UniSource as well) wants. They were simply ordered to improve reliability of power in Santa Cruz County (SCC), by adding a second powerline to complement the existing 115kV line from Sahuarita to Nogales. The electrical power consumption in SCC has approached at its peaks 60MW.
- Unisource has equivalent, emergency backup generation in Nogales. Because the extant 115kV powerline carries a load of 100MW, a second 115kV power line would obviously suffice to serve the power needs of SCC for decades to come.
- 3 Monumental decisions on power infrastructure should not become monuments to ineptitude that will hinder an inevitable shift to renewable energy as well as distributed and local generation.
- 2  
cont. Given that the main reason adduced by TEP is a misrepresentation of ACC order 62011, their current plan should be rejected out of hand. A no-action decision is the only logical outcome for DOE.
- 2) TEP's 345kV powerline would not improve reliability significantly:
- 4 At present, it is clearly false that an additional line, whatever its capacity, will improve reliability of power delivery in SCC. Statistics of

**Comment No. 4**

Refer to the response to Comment 3 above regarding the authority of the ACC to decide how it believes energy should be furnished within Arizona's borders.

**Comment No. 5**

Energy conservation does not meet TEP's proposal and thus is not evaluated as an alternative in this EIS (refer to the response to ACC Comment 3).

**Comment No. 6**

The maximum level at which the proposed 345-kV transmission line would be operated is 500 MW (refer to the response to Border Power Plant Working Group, Comment 2). If TEP wanted to operate the proposed 345-kV transmission line above 500 MW, TEP would have to apply to DOE for an amendment to their Presidential Permit, and DOE would have to perform additional analysis required by NEPA.

Section 1.1.2 of the Final EIS has been revised to provide additional background on TEP's business plan and the proceedings of the ACC. Section 1.5 of the Final EIS describes TEP's proposed project capacity and usage, including capacity that would be available for transfer of energy between the United States and Mexico. Any additional information beyond this background information and project description is not related to environmental impacts and is beyond the scope of the EIS.

**Falco, Emilio**  
**Page 3 of 6**

4 cont.	power outages clearly show that the overwhelming majority are in the local distribution of power, not in the 115kV line. In fact, Citizens did improve those statistics considerably over the past few years, thanks to a concerted effort on infrastructure improvements. It is true that considering a 10-year horizon, more power could be needed in SCC. But a 115kV powerline would suffice amply to cover the needs of SCC for several decades. That will remain unchanged for this time span, given the growth rates in SCC. It would be foolish to attempt to plan beyond that.
5	TEP has not proposed to encourage conservation in SCC, especially in regard to outdoor lighting for businesses. That should be a pivotal part of the DEIS. It is not there.
4 cont.	TEP has not provided specific plans for the DEIS, showing exactly how their proposed powerline would improve reliability in the delivery of electricity in SCC. That should be an absolute requirement, given that TEP makes a claim of improved reliability for their proposed powerline.
	Therefore, another major argument of TEP, the need for the proposed powerline for improved reliability, is invalid. Again, a no-action decision is the only logical outcome.
	3) TEP has not provided any detailed business plan for exploitation of their proposed powerline:
6	The DEIS provides only the vaguest descriptions of how TEP plans to deal with Mexico and its state-owned electricity provider. How much power will the powerline carry over time, over the next decades, how do they plan to derive profit, why do they expect to make any profit, what are their financial projections. That should be part of the DEIS and its successor EIS, as 80% of the initial power load carried by these lines would not end up in SCC but elsewhere.

**Comment No. 7**

Section 3.10, Human Health and Environment, of the EIS acknowledges the present uncertainty regarding EMF health effects, and contains a summary (with backup material in Appendix B) of the existing credible scientific evidence relevant to evaluating the potential impacts of EMF, as required by NEPA-implementing regulations (40 CFR 1502.22).

The Federal agencies concur that EMF levels would vary depending on the distance from the transmission line, and have thus included Table 4.10-2 in the Draft and Final EISs presenting the EMF strengths that would be present at different distances from the centerline of the proposed transmission line. The Federal agencies also concur that EMF levels directly underneath the transmission line may be potentially 100 times larger than EMF levels at locations farther removed from the transmission line. Appendix B of the EIS presents studies on human health effects from transmission lines and states that uncertainty exists on whether long-term, lower exposures (typically associated with transmission lines) and short-term, higher exposures (typically associated with appliances) are comparable in their potential effects on human health.

**Comment No. 8**

Chapter 3 presents a description of the affected environment and Chapter 4 analyzes the potential impacts to these existing resources from the proposed project, including potential impacts from the proposed Central Corridor.

**Falco, Emilio**  
**Page 4 of 6**

6 cont.	<p>Given that the total capacity of the powerline could eventually be increased to 2000MW, that percentage would shrink to 5%, making the case against TEP's proposed powerline that much stronger.</p> <p>TEP has likely not provided the required details in their business plan because they cannot. That again should lead to a no-action decision.</p>
7	<p>4) The DEIS is deficient in its treatment of the effect of EMFs on human health:</p> <p>High-voltage powerlines such as TEP wants produce magnetic fields of about 1mG at a distance of about 100m to each side of the line. The DEIS neglects to discuss the fact that directly underneath the powerline, the field can be about 100 times larger (see, for example, <a href="http://www.emfs.info/Source_transmission.asp">http://www.emfs.info/Source_transmission.asp</a>). If the proposed powerline were built in the central corridor, a significant number of residents would be forced to drive underneath the wiring, possibly several times a day, which could result in periodic exposure to fields 100 times larger than shown in the DEIS, i.e., 100mG, for a few seconds each time. The concern would be the much higher fields that these residents would experience periodically and over the long term.</p>
	<p>Residents who would be living near the ROW for the powerline would be exposed continuously to lower-level fields, about 0.01 mG or less at 1000m. It is disingenuous to offer appliances as a comparison, because these are on episodically, for a few minutes each time, and the user would not be in their close proximity for the most part. All of these facts imply that the risks to residents could be significantly greater than suggested in the DEIS.</p>

**Comment No. 9**

The photograph of the EPNG pipeline ROW in Figure 3.2-6 was taken looking directly down the pipeline ROW to accurately capture the ROW and surrounding area.

Section 3.3.2, Wildlife, has been revised in the Final EIS to discuss wildlife surveys that were conducted in the corridors. Wildlife surveys were conducted in the corridors for special status species such as the Pima pineapple cactus and the cactus ferruginous pygmy owl as part of preparation of the Biological Assessments in support of the proposed project. In addition, ongoing wildlife surveys conducted by USFS and Arizona Game and Fish Department were relied upon as part of the analysis of the affected environment and potential environmental impacts. Any additional project-specific wildlife surveys are generally not required for a NEPA evaluation.

In Figure 4.2-3, the map of the Western Corridor is shaded to indicate visibility from travelways. The EIS states that as the Western Corridor crosses I-19 and continues southwest, residents, travelers, and recreationalists would have intermittent views of the proposed project in the foreground and middleground, with views from many areas in lower terrain obscured by the hills and main tailings piles in the area (see Section 4.2.2).

**Comment No. 10**

The Federal agencies note the commentor's preference for the No Action Alternative.

**Falco, Emilio**  
**Page 5 of 6**

7 cont.	<p>The DEIS effectively ignored, by relegating the information to the end of Appendix B, a very significant study that was completed in June 2002 in California (see <a href="http://www.dhs.cahwnet.gov/ehib/emf/RiskEvaluation/riskeval.html">http://www.dhs.cahwnet.gov/ehib/emf/RiskEvaluation/riskeval.html</a>.)</p> <p>The executive summary of this study makes it clear: prolonged exposure to powerline EMFs is likely to increase the incidence of certain forms of cancer, especially among children, and such risks should be a significant factor in powerline siting. The DEIS concentrated instead on an older study by NIHES that was published in 1999. The goal was clear: concentrate on a study that would shine a more favorable light on the effects of EMFs.</p>
8	<p>It is impossible for TEP to effectively minimize the risks of their proposed powerline in the central corridor. The central corridor is not worth potentially sacrificing human health for TEP's (and nobody else's) gain. A higher standard than used in the DEIS is required. It would be interesting to find out how close to their powerline TEP employees would be willing to allow their families to live. The rational alternative from the point of view of the central corridor is the no-action decision.</p>
9	<p>5) The DEIS needs significant revision to pass muster as an official document:</p> <p>The DEIS is faulty in its form: the editing was poor, with countless typos; it displays ignorant spelling such as Chilitepene for Chiltepin, Luback Creek for Tubac Creek; there were incorrect figure references and claims that vegetation was cleared in a wide swath around the EPNG gas pipeline (by showing a misleadingly angled photograph, Figure 3.2-6), whereas the reality is that only narrow ROW clearing is in place. The list is endless and will not be included here!</p>

**Falco, Emilio**  
**Page 6 of 6**

9 cont.	<p>The DEIS is faulty in its substance. Only a few examples will be given, but many more can easily be found. The DEIS makes the incredible statement that "no wildlife surveys were conducted in the corridors" (section 3.3.2, before 3.3.2.1). In other words, a high school student with internet access could have produced the ineffable Harris results included in the DEIS. The DEIS states that landforms and vegetation would hide the powerline, and that travelers along I-19 would not see the powerline. That may be true at times (depending on the angle of the Sun), except of course for those most directly affected, the residents near the Central Corridor.</p>
	<p>Their views should enter the DEIS in exponential form. Hikers would also see the powerline on the W side of the Tumacacoris every single time they hiked in the area. These are cumulative impacts, not temporary as one might experience while driving along I-19.</p>
10	<p>The poor quality of the DEIS in many respects should be a warning that the underlying project is not worthy of consideration. The no-action alternative should be the final outcome of the EIS process.</p>
	<p>Emilio E. Falco, Ph.D.          PO Box 3371          Tubac, AZ 85646</p>

Ferris, Jeanne  
Page 1 of 2

From: Jeanne Ferris [SMTP:j ferris@hotmail.com]  
To: Pell, Jerry  
Cc:  
Subject: TEP's EIS  
Sent: 10/14/2003 1:37 a.m Importance: Normal

Dear Dr. Pell and DOE Members,

1 This is a response to the EIS concerning the TEP Sahuarita-  
Nogales Transmission line. Let me begin by urging you to  
refuse to issue a permit for this line. I realize that you, the  
DOE, are under the directives of this current administration in  
their effort to use the public lands to the fullest possible  
commercial extent. Yet I prevail upon you to use your best  
judgment in not allowing this issue to continue unopposed. I  
am not in favor of this whole project. I believe there are very  
2 legitimate alternatives to erecting this massive power line to  
Nogales to supply them with more power. I truly believe the  
purpose of this project is to transmit power from Mexico into  
this country. This is happening in California and the resulting  
pollution from this is deplorable. I live here in Arivaca to  
3 avoid polluted air and water and have no wish to be exposed  
to it for the benefit of power companies. TEP may not have  
any plans to build power plants in Mexico, but I'll wager that  
someone does and TEP will make money from transmitting  
that power north. I cannot believe that this type of plan is in

#### Comment No. 1

The Federal agencies note the commentor's preference for the No Action Alternative.

#### Comment No. 2

Section 1.2 of the Final EIS explains the roles of the Federal agencies in developing alternatives for the proposed project. Where an applicant seeks a permit for a particular business project, such as the case with TEP's proposed project, the Federal agencies generally limit their review of alternatives to those that would satisfy the applicant's proposal and decide whether that proposal is or is not worthy of receiving a permit. The Federal agencies do not review alternatives that are not within the scope of the applicant's proposal. Similarly, the agencies do not direct the applicant to alter its proposal; instead, the agencies decide whether a permit is appropriate for the proposal as the applicant envisions it. It is not for the agency to run the applicant's business and to change the applicant's proposal, but only to evaluate the environmental effects of the applicant's business proposal as offered. Accordingly, the EIS evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives, which include the full spectrum of alternatives that would satisfy the applicant's proposal.

#### Comment No. 3

TEP's purpose and need for the proposed project, as provided to DOE in TEP's Presidential Permit Application, is "...to construct a double-circuit 345 kV, alternating current transmission line to interconnect the existing electrical systems of TEP and Citizens Utilities ("Citizens") in Nogales, Arizona, with a further interconnection to be made from Nogales, Arizona to the CFE transmission system..." The Federal agencies do not have any information suggesting that any power plant construction in Mexico is reliant upon or otherwise connected to TEP's proposed project. Therefore, the potential for construction of power plants in Mexico is not a connected action and is not analyzed in Chapter 4, Environmental Effects, of the EIS.

Ferris, Jeanne

Page 2 of 2

3  
cont.

the interest of the people of the USA. It is in the interest of the multinational corporations that profit from transferring power thru the "Grid". (Think Enron) If you should go ahead and issue this permit, I urge you to reconsider your preferred route thru the Atascosa Highlands. I have studied the EIS and nowhere in it does it make a case to ruin the beautiful, pristine land that the western route encompasses. There is NO advantage to this route and quite a few disadvantages. Since the Arizona Corporation Commission picked this route one of its members has been removed for shady practices and is still being investigated. I was there when the line siteing committee drove out the Ruby Rd. to look over the various routes. It was just a shame. They never bothered to step out of their air-conditioned van and really look at the land that they chose to destroy. I felt that they had already made up their minds and this was just a sham. If you haven't read the latest issue the Sky Island Alliance I urge you to go to their site and take a look at what they said. They are at [www.skyislandalliance.org](http://www.skyislandalliance.org) I have yet to speak with anyone who thinks this is the best route or solution for Nogales' energy needs.

Thank you for your time and I pray you make the right decision.

Sincerely,  
Jeanne Ferris, [j\\_ferris@hotmail.com](mailto:j_ferris@hotmail.com)  
PO Box 94  
Arivaca AZ 85601

### Comment No. 3 (continued)

Chapter 5, Cumulative Effects, of the Final EIS has been augmented to discuss the growth of electricity demand in Mexico and the United States and the potential for new power plants, and to describe qualitatively the potential impacts in the United States (including air quality impacts) from power plant construction in southern Arizona and Sonora, Mexico. Chapter 5 has also been revised to describe the regulation of power plants in Mexico (including coordination between the United States and Mexico), potential fuel sources, and associated emissions.

Potential economic benefit to TEP from the proposed project is outside the scope of the EIS.

### Comment No. 4

Section 1.2 of the Final EIS explains the roles of the Federal agencies in developing alternatives for the proposed project. Where an applicant seeks a permit for a particular business project, such as the case with TEP's proposed project, the Federal agencies generally limit their review of alternatives to those that would satisfy the applicant's proposal and decide whether that proposal is or is not worthy of receiving a permit. The Federal agencies do not review alternatives that are not within the scope of the applicant's proposal. Similarly, the agencies do not direct the applicant to alter its proposal; instead, the agencies decide whether a permit is appropriate for the proposal as the applicant envisions it. It is not for the agency to run the applicant's business and to change the applicant's proposal, but only to evaluate the environmental effects of the applicant's business proposal as offered. Accordingly, the EIS evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives, which include the full spectrum of alternatives that would satisfy the applicant's proposal.

Ferris, Jeanne

Page 1 of 1

From: j\_ferris@hotmail.com  
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2003 2:17 AM  
To: Pell, Jerry  
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement for Tucson Electric Power's proposed 345 kilovolt powerline

Dr. Jerry Pell  
U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy (FE-27)  
1000 Independence Avenue. SW  
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Dr. Pell,

Re: Tucson Electric Power Sahuarita-Nogales Transmission line.

1 | I know that you are new to this position but I am sure that you know the particulars on this project. I am totally appalled that the Arizona Corporation Commission chose the western route as the only possible route for this unnecessary, HUGE power line.

2 | I am opposed to this line completely but adamantly opposed to running it through the beautiful, remote, pristine Coronado National Forest. I have lived here for 33 years and have marveled at how undeveloped and remote that area is. It would be more than a shame to ruin it. It would be criminal. There is no reason on earth to grant the power companies the right to rip up and degrade this area. This project would forever ruin it out there and it would never recover. I hope that you make the

1 | correct choice here and deny any special use permit for the  
cont. | Western and Crossover Routes.

Sincerely,  
Jeanne Ferris  
PO Box 94  
Arivaca, Arizona 85601

#### Comment No. 1

The ACC's selection of the Western Corridor does not limit the choices that each Federal agency can make in their ROD regarding the proposed project (see Section 1.5, NEPA Process, regarding the implications of selection of conflicting alternatives by the ACC and Federal agencies).

#### Comment No. 2

Sections 3.2 and 4.2 present a description of the existing visual resources and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project.

Sections 3.1.2 and 4.1.2 discuss existing recreational settings and activities, and analyze potential impacts to recreation from the proposed project. Section 4.1.2 specifically evaluates impacts to ROS indicators such as remoteness and naturalness, both of which would have changes that are "inconsistent" with the existing ROS classes for much of the length of the Western and Crossover Corridors within the Coronado National Forest. Analysis of the proposed Forest Plan amendments is contained in Appendix H.

Finkenstein, Michael  
Page 1 of 1

Sue Kozacek  
Acting Forest Supervisor  
Coronado National Forest  
300 W. Congress  
Tucson, AZ 85701

Dear Ms. Kozacek

My comments are regarding the "Tucson Electric Power Sahuarita-Nogales Transmission line  
DEIS and needed Forest Plan Amendments"

- 9/24/03
- 1 • The Tumacacori and Atascosa Mountains are an exceptional area for primitive recreation – the powerline is incompatible with the natural characteristics there.
  - 1 • I enjoy bird watching, hiking, biking, canyoneering, hunting, picnicking, etc. in the area affected by the powerline and would be negatively affected by the construction of the powerline in the Western or Crossover Routes.
  - 2 • TEP proposes to build over 20 new miles of road for the Preferred Route. The road density in the Tumacacori EMA is already above acceptable limits as set forth in the current Forest Plan. More road building, even with associated closures (often unsuccessful) would be in gross violation of the Forest Plan
  - 3 • A Forest Plan Amendment would only decrease the already dwindling supply of remote recreational experiences in the region and would impact many sensitive wildlife and plant species that are an important aspect of our southern Arizona natural heritage.
  - 4 • I urge you to deny the special use permit for the Western and Central Routes because they are not compatible with the current uses of the affected area

Sincerely,

  
Michael Finkenstein  
425 W Paseo Redondo  
Tucson, AZ 85701

#### Comment No. 1

Sections 3.1.2 and 4.1.2 discuss existing recreational settings and activities, and analyze potential impacts to recreation from the proposed project. Section 4.1.2 specifically evaluates impacts to ROS indicators such as remoteness and naturalness, both of which would have changes that are "inconsistent" with the existing ROS classes for much of the length of the Western and Crossover Corridors within the Coronado National Forest. Analysis of the proposed Forest Plan amendments is contained in Appendix H.

#### Commentor No. 2

The Tumacacori EMA of the Coronado National Forest in and of itself does not exceed road density limits set forth in the Forest Plan. Road density limits set forth in the Forest Plan are for the Forest as a whole, not for individual land units or EMAs within the Coronado National Forest.

Regarding the effectiveness of road closures, any authorization issued to implement the proposed project on the Coronado National Forest would contain terms and conditions to ensure road barrier effectiveness and maintenance, as appropriate. Based on these terms and conditions for ensuring the effectiveness of road closures, the proposed project is consistent with Forest Plan standards and guidelines for road density.

#### Comment No. 3

Refer to the response to Comment 1 above regarding the impacts of a Forest Plan amendment.

Sections 3.3 and 4.3 discuss existing biological resources and analyze the potential impacts to these resources from the proposed project, including potential impacts to endangered, threatened and special status species.

#### Comment No. 4

Sections 3.1 and 4.1 describe existing land use resources and analyze potential impacts to these resources.



**Finn, Tom**  
**Page 1 of 1**

Mr. Pell,

1 Based on my review of the Transmission Line Project from Tucson to Nogales, nearly 4000 people in the current (and planned) Rancho Sahuarita neighborhoods will be directly affected by the planned construction of additional 350 KV power line structures starting at the Tucson substation, running along the East boundary of Rancho Sahuarita, down to Nogales. The power lines will have a drastic negative effect on property values, a proposed golf course in the area, and will cause a great deal of concern to citizens relating to electromagnetic poisoning. Indeed, many exercise regularly on walking trails almost directly under the current transmission lines where the proposed lines will go.

2 THE PUBLIC INTEREST IS NOT SERVED BY THIS PROJECT. Very few in Rancho Sahuarita currently know about this project and TEP has done a great job keeping this away from the public. If residents in our community were informed about this project, there is no question you'd have hundreds, if not thousands, opposing this at the upcoming public hearings.

1  
cont. Once you provide me with the draft EIS, I will take the time to fully read the impact studies. Clearly, placing two 350 Kv lines within a quarter mile of 4000 densely populated residents and right on top of a walking trail used by hundreds of residents is not a good thing for the public, especially when there are better alternatives. Please add me to the agenda for the Thursday 9/25/03 public hearing in Green Valley and provide me a copy of the EIS via email prior to this hearing.

Regards,  
Tom Finn  
15229 S. Ave. Rancho Sereno  
Sahuarita, Arizona 520\*207-1615

**Comment No. 1**

While the Federal agencies recognize that a given property owner's value could be affected (positively or negatively) by the proposed project, the Federal agencies have not attempted to quantify theoretical public perceptions of property values should the proposed project be built.

The available data have not revealed any conclusive evidence that EMF exposure from power lines poses a hazard to animal or human health (see Sections 3.10 and 4.10, Health and Human Environment).

**Comment No. 2**

Section 1.6 of the Final EIS has been revised to explain the process conducted by the Federal agencies to invite public participation in the NEPA process, per CEQ requirements.